

Cawingredients – Community Liaison Group – Minutes

18 August 2022 6.45pm – Leeming Bar, Community Hub

Attendees:

Gerald Jennings – Chairman	John Board – Cawingredients
Cllr Carl Les – Elected Ward Member Bedale Ward	John Coultas – Architect on behalf of Cawingredients
Peter Jones – Development Manager, Hambleton District Council	Sam Deegan – Planning Consultant on behalf of Cawingredients
Sue Darbyshire – Resident	Laura Pinder – Secretariat – Social Communications
Jackie Kennedy – Parish Councillor	Rab Hastie - Resident
Matt Sawyer – Resident	Laurence Beardmore - President, York & North Yorkshire Chamber of Commerce
Iain Sanderson – Apex Acoustics (Guest)	

1. Welcome and apologies

Gerald Jennings (GJ) welcomed attendees and introductions were made. Apologies were received from Cllr John Weighell.

GJ, LB, MS, RH and SDarbyshire attended a site visit in advance of the meeting and expressed that it was useful and informative. JB was thanked for taking the group on the tour.

2. Minutes of last meeting

- Matters arising

ACTION PJ to send licensing/planning restrictions

ACTION SDeegan to circulate average wage information

ACTION Fore Consulting to attend next meeting

ACTION JC to table summer/winter visualisations at next meeting

The group discussed the next meeting and whether this would be the last meeting ahead of submission of the planning application. SDeegan was asked to clarify what will be tabled and discussed at the next meeting.

ACTION SDeegan to confirm items for next meeting

3. Update on Planning Application

SDeegan gave an update on the planning application. He advised that a site visit had taken place with the applicant's Landscape Architect alongside Hambleton DC's Planning Officer. SDeegan stated this was a productive meeting and viewpoints were agreed which SDeegan outlined to the group.

SDeegan outlined the process behind the Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA) and how this is scrutinised by the Planning Authority.

MS asked about the LVIA and suggested that the Local Plan consultation was unclear regarding the science behind such assessments.

MS asked to see the LVIA report once it is produced. The team advised that there is still quite a bit of work but the methodology could be shared now.

ACTION SDeegan to share LVIA methodology

PJ stated that for a development of this scale, Hambleton DC would seek a 3rd party assessment of the LVIA and that this would usually be North Yorkshire County Council's team.

SDeegan also stated that a further pre-application meeting had taken place to discuss noise and lighting, alongside the Council's Environmental Health Officer (EHO).

SDeegan stated that the intention is still to submit the full factory planning application on 9 September 2022.

SDeegan confirmed that the highways access application is in and running. Consultation responses have been received from the drainage authority, Bedale Parish Council and National Highways. National Highways had asked for some additional information which has been passed to the Transport Consultant, Fore Consulting. Fore will be invited to the next meeting.

ACTION SDeegan invite Fore Consulting to the next meeting

GJ queried the target determination date for the highways access application and SDeegan and PJ stated that 6 September is the target date, then a s.278 agreement would be reached which finalises the technical design of the junction.

At this point, JC suggested it might be useful for the group to meet again once the planning application is submitted, for the group to digest the documents that have been submitted and assist others in the community to understand the technical documents.

ACTION LP Coordinate further CLG meeting post-submission

CL left at 19.50

4. Noise update

Iain Sanderson of Apex Acoustics (noise consultants) gave an update.

- Noise surveys have been carried out earlier in the year and over a 4 day long period just completed over last weekend to determine representative daytime and night-time noise levels.
- Assessment being carried out to BS 4142 for the daytime and night time periods separately.
- This covers noise impact from operations (fixed and mobile plant, HGV movements, effluent process) and compares it to pre-existing background noise levels at nearby receptors. Targeting 5 dB below the existing background noise level, per agreement with Hambleton.
- DEFRA topology data is included in the model, and receptor heights are considered, e.g. someone stood in their garden vs. someone's bedroom window being at height.
- Each noise generating source is considered separately, and advice has been provided for attenuation (either by distance, screening or loudness) to control their impact.
- Good acoustic design has already been incorporated, such as by siting the majority of noise generating plant to the NE of site, away from receptors. The contribution of other mitigating

methods, such as the perimeter bund, effluent bund, and other discrete screening is included in the model.

- The contribution of trees and shrubbery to acoustic mitigation is not considered in the model in the interests of prudence, as they offer little attenuation over the distances present at this scheme. Their presence and subsequent visual screening (perhaps also masking noise provided by rustling leaves) may improve subjective response to site activity, but these are not quantified or included in the model to be prudent.
- BS 4142 assessment includes consideration of the character of the noise, to account for notable characteristics such as tonality or intermittency. Corrections for identified characteristics will be included in the assessment where necessary.
- Visits to the existing site have allowed a better understanding of operations, which can sometimes be lost when doing assessments based on archival or library data.

GJ asked whether the background readings take account of vehicle movements? IS stated that archival data is added to the modelling to factor this in.

IS stated that the model is the worst case scenario at the existing factory.

MS asked if 44db is the background reading at the field, will the proposed factory be noisier? IS stated no the operations won't be noisier than 44db.

MS asked whether the noise assessment factors in daytime noise and night-time noise? IS replied yes.

RH asked whether there would be a cumulative impact as phase one and then phase two are developed? IS stated no, the modelling takes account of both phases of development.

LP asked whether the negligible impact on noise levels is as a result of mitigation measures? IS stated yes.

JC asked whether noise from the truck stop, Exelby Services, Conygarth, is factored in? IS said that there are factors included that account for 'spikes' in noise levels.

SDarbyshire suggested that if there are more vehicular movements, then there must be more noise? IS stated that vehicle movements would need to double existing levels to result in a 3db increase in noise.

MS asked IS to show on the map where noise monitoring equipment was placed which IS did.

GJ asked IS whether the report is complete and IS stated not quite. GJ asked if the group could see the methodology. IS stated that BS 4142 methodology is followed.

PJ reiterated the Council's EHO will scrutinise the submitted noise assessment.

PJ asked about inclusion of a single significant activity, e.g. aircraft? IS stated that BS 4142 adds a penalty into the model to account for tonal, impulsive or intermittent noise.

MS asked about the inclusion of trees in abatement measures. IS stated that trees are not considered acoustic screening, but they can sometimes have an effect e.g. rustling leaves disguising noise sources.

GJ asked whether IS produces a report that suggests necessary mitigation measures? JC explained that the scheme design has been shaped by IS's report and that the plans have been developed in a landscape/residential amenity-led way.

SDarbyshire asked whether the suggested bunding is based on IS's report, IS stated that Apex Acoustics have offered advice into the design.

IS was thanked and left the meeting at 8.30.

5. Masterplan update

JC outlined that Cawingredients would like to keep the cladding colour as per the existing facility to reflect their brand 'look and feel.'

The group discussed cladding colour and appreciated that the existing facility blends well with its surroundings, but the new facility would be within a more rural context and that a tonal green palette would be more fitting. Further discussion on colour options was held.

GJ asked how significant colour scheme is to the group? MS stated that visual impact is his number one issue, followed by noise. RH stated that noise was his greatest concern.

JB asked whether the group felt any solace from the visit on noise matters? MS stated yes, and further so from IS's contribution to the group.

MS asked whether hedgerows will be retained? JC replied yes they will.

MS stated that he felt noise matters and hedgerows could be ticked off.

PJ stated that the more matters that could be addressed now, the better.

JC agreed to take away the group's feedback on cladding colour to Cawingredients

ACTION JC to feed back to Cawingredients on cladding colour

JC asked about the septic tanks in gardens on Low Street and also stated that the drainage engineer couldn't find the Yorkshire Water foul sewer. JC and SDarbyshire agreed to meet with the drainage engineer to discuss this on site. JC stated that Cawingredients would be happy to connect those properties into the foul sewer so long as it is practical to do so. SDarbyshire stated that that would make residents happy. JC stated that Cawingredients wouldn't take responsibility for it once connected and that a small pumping station or micro sewage plant might be required, which local residents would have to look after and maintain.

ACTION JC to meet SDarbyshire on site to discuss drainage

JC explained that surface water will runoff into 2 attenuation ponds. The volume of storage will then discharge into the culvert around the site.

JC confirmed that the drainage strategy will be available for the next meeting.

ACTION JC to table drainage strategy at next meeting

The group discussed the potential cycle/pedestrian access at Low Street. There was some concern that this could lead to inconsiderate parking on Low Street and entering the site on foot. JB stated that staff and visitors would be directed to the vehicle access and that with ample parking provision, it would be of no benefit to people to park on Low Street. The group discussed that the access would enable workers to walk or cycle into the site, a key sustainability target.

JC highlighted the parking strategy which totalled 300 parking spaces to allow ample room for vehicle movements at shift changeover.

GJ asked about the lighting strategy. GJ stated he was impressed with the lighting provision seen on the site tour. SDeegan stated that the lighting strategy would be available to be tabled at the next meeting and that there should have been some comments from the EHO by this point.

ACTION SDeegan to table lighting strategy at next meeting

8. Feedback from members (All)

No feedback.

9. Date of next meeting (All)

Monday 5 September at the earlier time of 6.00pm.

10. AOB (All)

SDarbyshire asked about minutes etc. on the website, LP advised where these can be found.

LP asked the group if a photo could be taken to include in the Statement of Community Involvement which is submitted as part of the planning application.

The group discussed the future of the CLG. PJ stated that other planning schemes with similar groups have continued to meet through the construction phase.

The group agreed a meeting to go through the submitted application would be useful and that this would likely be w/c 19 September or w/c 26 September.